

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICAH TAFARI KEYES-ANDERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

A. CHAPA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:25-cv-00077-SKO

**ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF THE  
COURT TO RE-SERVE FIRST  
SCREENING ORDER**

**ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO  
RESPOND TO THE FIRST SCREENING  
ORDER WITHIN 21 DAYS**

Plaintiff Micah Tafari Keyes-Anderson is appearing pro se and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. section 1983.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The Court issued its First Screening Order on September 29, 2025, (Doc. 10), which was served on Plaintiff that same date.

On October 22, 2025, the docket for this action indicates the screening order was returned by the United States Postal Service marked “Undeliverable, Refused, Return to Sender, Unable to Forward.”

Because the return of the screening order appears to be mistake, the Court will direct the Clerk of the Court to re-serve Plaintiff at his address of record and order Plaintiff to respond within 21 days.

//

1           **II.     DISCUSSION**

2           A review of the docket for this action reveals Plaintiff's address of record is

3                     Micah Tafari Keyes-Anderson  
4                     BF-1818  
5                     CALIFORNIA STATE PRISON, SACRAMENTO (290066)  
6                     P.O. BOX 290066  
7                     REPRESA, CA 95671-0066

8           Although the USPS's recent return of the screening order was marked as "Undeliverable,"  
9           the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's inmate locator tool reveals Plaintiff  
10          remains incarcerated at California State Prison, Sacramento, as of today's date.<sup>1</sup> Thus, it appears  
11          that the screening order was mistakenly returned by the institution. The Court will direct the  
12          Clerk of the Court to re-serve the First Screening Order on Plaintiff at his address of record on  
13          file with the Court. Plaintiff must respond within 21 days of the date of this Order.

14           **III.     CONCLUSION AND ORDER**

15          Accordingly, the Court **HEREBY ORDERS:**

- 16          1. The Clerk of the Court is **DIRECTED** to re-serve the First Screening Order (Doc. 10)  
17             to Plaintiff at his address of record;
- 18          2. Plaintiff **SHALL** respond to the First Screening Order, **within 21 days of the date of**  
19             **this Order**, by:
- 20             a. notifying the Court in writing that he does not wish to file a first amended  
21                complaint, and he is willing to proceed only on the Eighth Amendment  
22                excessive force claims against Defendants Chapa, Luna, Salazar, Aguilar,  
23                Gamboa-Campos, Bravo-Rodriguez, Valero, and Cruz; the remaining claims  
24                against any defendant to be dismissed; *or*
- 25             b. filing a first amended complaint curing the deficiencies identified by the Court  
26                in the First Screening Order; *or*
- 27             c. in the alternative, filing a notice of voluntary dismissal;

28          

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://ciris.mt.cdcr.ca.gov/results?cdcrNumber=BF1818>, as of 11/10/2025. Plaintiff was incarcerated at  
that same institution when he filed his original complaint on December 17, 2024. (*See* Doc. 1.)

1           **3. Plaintiff is advised that a failure to comply with this Order or the First Screening**  
2           **Order will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed, without**  
3           **prejudice, for a failure to obey court orders and failure to prosecute.**

4  
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: **November 10, 2025**

*/s/ Sheila K. Oberto*  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE